

# UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER	
ADA800660	
CLASSIFICATION CHANGES	
TO:	unclassified
FROM:	confidential
LIMITATION CHANGES	
TO: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	
FROM: Distribution authorized to DoD only; Administrative/Operational Use; 17 MAY 1945. Other requests shall be referred to National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC. Pre-dates formal DoD distribution statements. Treat as DoD only.	
AUTHORITY	
NACA list dtd Mar 1949; NASA TR Server website	

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

# Reproduction Quality Notice

This document is part of the Air Technical Index [ATI] collection. The ATI collection is over 50 years old and was imaged from roll film. The collection has deteriorated over time and is in poor condition. DTIC has reproduced the best available copy utilizing the most current imaging technology. ATI documents that are partially legible have been included in the DTIC collection due to their historical value.

If you are dissatisfied with this document, please feel free to contact our Directorate of User Services at [703] 767-9066/9068 or DSN 427-9066/9068.

**Do Not Return This Document  
To DTIC**

Reproduced by  
**AIR DOCUMENTS DIVISION**



**HEADQUARTERS AIR MATERIEL COMMAND**  
**WRIGHT FIELD, DAYTON, OHIO**

*The*  
**U.S. GOVERNMENT**

**IS ABSOLVED**

**FROM ANY LITIGATION WHICH MAY**

**ENSUE FROM THE CONTRACTORS IN -**

**FRINGING ON THE FOREIGN PATENT**

**RIGHTS WHICH MAY BE INVOLVED.**



REEL - C  
5 8 8

A.T.I.

1 6 4 0 4

**CONFIDENTIAL**

MR No. L5D27a

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

CONFIDENTIAL **ATI No. 16404**

25-1

MEMORANDUM REPORT

for the

Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department

WIND-TUNNEL TESTS OF THE 0.15-SCALE POWERED MODEL

OF THE FLEETWINGS XBTK-1 AIRPLANE

I - LONGITUDINAL STABILITY AND CONTROL

TEST NO. NACA 2332

By Joseph Weil and Rebecca I. Boykin

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory  
Langley Field, Va

MAY 17 1945

CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT

This document contains classified information affecting the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Act, USC 5031 and 52. Its transmission or the revelation of its contents in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law. Information so classified may be imparted only to persons in the military and naval services of the United States, appropriate civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government who have a legitimate interest therein and to United States citizens of known loyalty in the discretion who of necessity must be informed thereof.

Air Documents Division, T-2  
AMC, Wright Field  
Microfilm No.  
**RC 588 F 16404**

CONFIDENTIAL

X-136912



MR No. L5D27a

CONFIDENTIAL

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

MEMORANDUM REPORT

for the

Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department

WIND-TUNNEL TESTS OF THE 0.15-SCALE POWERED MODEL

OF THE FLEETWINGS XBTK-1 AIRPLANE

I - LONGITUDINAL STABILITY AND CONTROL

TED NO. NACA 2332

By Joseph Weil and Rebecca I. Boykin

SUMMARY

An investigation was undertaken to determine the probable static stability and control characteristics of the XBTK-1 airplane. Data from which these characteristics can be determined were obtained from tests of a 0.15-scale powered model in the Langley 7- by 10-foot tunnel.

The results of that part of the investigation which deals specifically with static longitudinal stability and control and stall characteristics are presented in this paper.

The longitudinal stability will probably be satisfactory for all contemplated flight conditions at the rearmost center-of-gravity location with the elevator fixed and free. Power effects were small.

Sufficient elevator control will be available to trim in any flight condition away from the ground. The stick forces may be light if the spring stiffness presently contemplated is used.

Increasing the slotted flap deflection above  $30^\circ$  increased  $C_{L_{max}}$  only slightly.

Stalling characteristics will probably be satisfactory. In general, stall started at the wing fold line

CONFIDENTIAL

X-136912

CONFIDENTIAL

2

NR No. L5D27a

and spread inboard faster than toward the tip. Power delayed the stall over portions of the wing immersed in the slipstream. The presence of the fuel tank, radar, and wing guns did not appreciably affect the stall trends.

INTRODUCTION

At the request of the Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, a series of wind-tunnel tests was made in the Langley 7- by 10-foot tunnel of the Fleetwings XBTK-1 model (0.15 scale) with power. In addition, tests were made in the Langley 4- by 6-foot tunnel in order to determine isolated horizontal-tail characteristics.

The objective of these tests was to determine the complete stability and control characteristics of the model and provide data from which the flying qualities of the airplane could be estimated. The information thus obtained can be used to ascertain the amount and extent of modifications necessary to insure satisfactory handling qualities of the contemplated airplane.

The present report includes the results of the investigation of the longitudinal stability and control characteristics of the model. Photographs of tuft surveys made to determine the stall progression for various model conditions are also presented.

COEFFICIENTS AND SYMBOLS

The results of the tests are presented as standard NACA coefficients of forces and moments. Pitching-moment coefficients are given about the center-of-gravity location shown in figure 1 (25.6 percent of the mean aerodynamic chord). The data are referred to a system of axes originating at the center of gravity in which the Z axis is in the plane of symmetry and perpendicular to the relative wind, the X axis is in the plane of symmetry and perpendicular to the Z axis, and the Y axis is perpendicular to the plane of symmetry.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

3

The coefficients and symbols are defined as follows:

$C_L$	lift coefficient ( $Z/qS$ )
$C_{L_t}$	tail-lift coefficient (Tail lift/ $qS_t$ )
$C_{D_R}$	resultant-drag coefficient ( $X/qS$ )
$C_m$	pitching-moment coefficient ( $M/qSc$ )
$C_{H_e}$	elevator hinge-moment coefficient ( $H_e/qb_e\bar{c}_e^2$ )
$T_c'$	effective thrust coefficient ( $T_e/qS$ )
$nD/V$	propeller diameter-advance ratio
$Q_c$	torque coefficient ( $Q/\rho V^2 D^3$ )
$\eta$	propulsive efficiency ( $T_e V/2\pi nQ$ )

where the quantities are defined below

$Z$	force along Z axis, positive when directed upward, pounds
$X$	force along X axis, positive when directed backward, pounds
$M$	moment about Y axis, pound-feet
$H_e$	elevator hinge moment, pound-feet
$T_e$	effective thrust, pounds
$Q$	torque, pound-feet
$q$	dynamic pressure ( $\rho V^2/2$ ), pounds per square foot
$S$	wing area (8.55 square feet on model)
$S_t$	horizontal-tail area (1.80 square feet on model)
$c$	wing mean aerodynamic chord (1.22 feet on model)
$\bar{c}_e$	root mean square chord of elevator behind hinge line (0.191 foot on model)

CONFIDENTIAL

X-136912

**CONFIDENTIAL**

4

MR No. L5D27a

$b_w$  wing span (7.30 feet on model)  
 $b_e$  span of elevator (2.64 feet on model)  
 $V$  air velocity, feet per second  
 $D$  propeller diameter (2.04 feet on model)  
 $n$  revolutions per second  
and  
 $\rho$  mass density of air, slugs per cubic foot  
 $\alpha$  angle of attack of thrust line, degrees  
 $i_t$  angle of stabilizer with respect to thrust line, degrees; positive when trailing edge is down  
 $\delta$  control-surface deflection, degrees  
 $\epsilon$  average downwash angle, degrees  
 $\beta$  propeller blade angle at 0.75 radius (18° on model)

Side-force factor  $\frac{10^5}{32} \int_{0.2}^{1.0} \frac{b}{D} \sin \beta d\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)$

$c_w$  wing chord at any station  
 $r$  propeller radius to given section, feet  
 $b$  propeller blade width, feet  
 $R$   $D/2$ , feet  
 $l_t$  tail length  
 $n_o$  tail-off aerodynamic center location, percent mean aerodynamic chord  
 $n_p$  neutral-point location, percent mean aerodynamic chord  
 $c_t$  tail chord at any station

**CONFIDENTIAL**

CONFIDENTIAL

NR No. L5D27a

5

$\frac{dC_m}{di_t}$  rate of change of pitching-moment coefficient  
with stabilizer setting

$\frac{dC_m}{dC_L}$  rate of change of pitching-moment coefficient  
with model lift coefficient

$\frac{d\epsilon}{d\alpha}$  rate of change of average downwash angle with  
angle of attack of thrust line

$\left(\frac{dC_L}{d\alpha}\right)_1$  rate of change of trim lift coefficient with  
angle of attack of thrust line

$C_{m_t}$  pitching-moment coefficient required of tail  
for trim at elevator-fixed neutral-point  
location

$\frac{q_t}{q}$  ratio of effective dynamic pressure over the  
horizontal tail to free-stream dynamic  
pressure

$\frac{d(q_t/q)}{dC_L}$  rate of change of  $q_t/q$  with model lift coef-  
ficient

Subscripts:

o tail off

e elevator

r rudder

f flap

$t_1$  isolated horizontal tail

t horizontal tail; tab (when used with  $\delta$ )

MODEL AND APPARATUS

The XBTK-1 airplane is a single-engine, single-  
place, carrier-based dive and torpedo bomber with a

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

6

MR No. L5D27a

full cantilever low wing. It has partial-span extensible slotted flaps, "picket-fence" dive brakes, adjustable stabilizer, and a fully retractable conventional landing gear. The elevator is aerodynamically balanced by a shielded horn type of balance (medium nose shape) in combination with a spring tab. Trim changes are accomplished with the adjustable stabilizer. At design gross weight the airplane carries a radar unit under the right wing panel and an auxiliary droppable fuel tank under the left wing panel in addition to one 1000-pound bomb under the fuselage. The physical characteristics of the airplane which were supplied by the manufacturer are presented in tables I, II, and III.

The model was supplied by the Fleetwings Division of the Kaiser Cargo Corporation. It was not checked for accuracy. A three-view drawing of the model, as received, is shown in figure 1 and photographs of the original model are presented in figures 2(a) and 2(b).

The center wing panel has an NACA 2416 airfoil section with no taper or twist and is set at  $2^\circ$  with respect to the thrust line. The outer panels have a  $0.50$  taper ratio and  $-2.2^\circ$  geometric twist. The theoretical tip section is an NACA 4412. All of the tests reported herein were made with a wing dihedral of  $8\frac{1}{4}^\circ$  in the outboard panel. The flaps are of the extensible slotted type constructed in three sections, namely, a center section below the fuselage of about 5.4 inches span on the model and two outboard sections which extend from the center section to the wing outer panels. For normal operation (all tests reported in this paper) these three sections operate as a single unit but when a torpedo is carried, the center-section flap is locked in the retracted position. Details of the flap positions for various deflections tested are presented in figure 3.

The model was normally tested with a radar dome under the right wing and a fuel tank under the left wing. Two  $1\frac{1}{4}$ -inch diameter dowels 1 inch long were placed in the leading edge of the wing 18.09 inches from the center line of the model to represent cannon.

The horizontal tail had a modified NACA 66,2-015 root section tapering to a modified NACA 66,2-009 theoretical tip section. The airfoils were modified

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. 15D27a

7

in that the cusped trailing edge was replaced by a straight-line fairing which was tangent to the true contour at the  $0.70c_t$  station and extended to the trailing edge. The elevator, which was statically mass-balanced, had an area of about 28.2 percent of the horizontal-tail area, was of constant percent chord ( $\frac{c_e}{c_t} = 0.30$ ) up to the horn and was unsealed for most of the tests. Details of the horizontal tail surface and elevator are shown in figure 4.

The model configurations referred to in the text and on the figures are as follows:

1. Cruising configuration:  
Flaps neutral  
Landing gear retracted
2. Landing configuration:  
Flaps extended ( $45^\circ$ )  
Landing gear extended
  - (a) Main wheels down
  - (b) Wheel-well cut-out in wing open
  - (c) Tail wheel down
  - (d) Tail-wheel door open
  - (e) Arresting hook extended

The precision of setting the angular deflections of the movable surfaces on the model is estimated to be as follows:  $i_t \pm 0^\circ 5'$ ,  $\delta_e \pm 0^\circ 30'$ ,  $\delta_f$  and  $\delta_t \pm 1^\circ 0'$ .

Power was obtained from a 56-horsepower, three-phase induction motor. The speed of this motor was determined by observation of a cathode-ray oscillograph which indicates the output of a small alternator connected to the shaft of the motor. The time base for the oscillograph pattern is controlled by an audio-oscillator of the electrically driven tuning-fork type, the frequency of which is known within 0.1 percent.

TESTS

Test conditions.— Tests of the complete model were made at dynamic pressures of 9.21 and 16.37 pounds per square foot, which correspond to airspeeds of about 60 and 80 miles per hour. The test Reynolds numbers

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

8

MR No. 15D27a

were about 685,000 and 910,000 based on the wing mean aerodynamic chord of 1.22 feet. Because of the turbulence factor of 1.6 for the Langley 7- by 10-foot tunnel, effective Reynolds numbers (for maximum lift coefficients) were about 1,000,000 and 1,460,000, respectively.

The tests of the isolated horizontal tail were made at a dynamic pressure of 13 pounds per square foot, corresponding to an airspeed of 71 miles per hour under standard sea-level atmospheric conditions. The test Reynolds number was about 323,000 based on the average chord of 5.81 inches. The turbulence factor is 1.93 for the Langley 4- by 6-foot tunnel, and hence, the effective Reynolds number (for maximum lift coefficient) was about 624,000 for these tests.

Test procedure.- The thrust calibration of the model propeller was obtained by measuring the resultant drag of the model (cruising configuration) for a range of propeller speeds near zero lift. The thrust coefficients were then computed from the equation

$$T_c' = C_D - C_{D_R}$$

where  $C_D$  is the drag of the model with the propeller removed. The torque coefficients were obtained from a motor calibration (torque as a function of minimum current) using the values of minimum current at each propeller speed. The results of the propeller calibration are presented in figure 5.

Using the data of figure 5, it is only necessary to vary the propeller speed for a particular tunnel speed to obtain a range of thrust coefficients assuming that in the normal angle-of-attack range the propeller thrust is independent of the angle of inclination of the propeller at constant  $nd/V$ .

The effective thrust coefficients at which the power-on tests were made are shown in figure 6 as a function of lift coefficient for constant power with a constant-speed propeller. These curves were supplied by the manufacturer.

All tests were made at a dynamic pressure of 16.37 pounds per square foot except tests simulating

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

9

the take-off power condition in the landing configuration which were made at a dynamic pressure of 9.21 pounds per square foot. This difference was necessitated because of power limitations of the model motor.

The thrust coefficient at which windmilling tests were made was about -0.010.

CORRECTIONS

Langley 7- by 10-foot tunnel.- All data have been corrected for tare caused by the model support strut. Jet-boundary corrections have been applied to the angles of attack, the drag coefficients, and the tail-on pitching-moment coefficients. The corrections were computed as follows:

$$\Delta\alpha = 57.3 \delta_w \frac{S}{C} C_L \text{ (degrees)}$$

$$\Delta C_D = \delta_w \frac{S}{C} C_L^2$$

$$\Delta C_m = -57.3 \left( \frac{\delta_T}{\sqrt{q_t/q}} - \delta_w \right) \frac{S}{C} \frac{dC_m}{dt} C_L$$

where

$\delta_w$  jet-boundary correction factor at the wing (0.116)

$\delta_T$  total jet-boundary correction factor at the tail (0.196)

$S$  model wing area (8.55 square feet)

$C$  tunnel cross-sectional area (69.59 square feet)

$\frac{dC_m}{dt}$  rate of change of pitching-moment coefficient with stabilizer setting as determined in tests

$\frac{q_t}{q}$  ratio of effective dynamic pressure over the horizontal tail to free-stream dynamic pressure

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

10

MR No. L5D27a

All jet-boundary corrections were added to the test data.

Langley 4- by 6-foot tunnel.- The angles of attack of the tail have been corrected for the effect of the jet boundaries. The correction was added to the measured values and was as follows:

$$\Delta\alpha_t = 1.097C_{L_t} \text{ (degrees)}$$

The lift coefficients were corrected for support-strut tares. No tares or jet-boundary corrections were applied to the hinge-moment coefficients inasmuch as these corrections were estimated to be negligible.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

Tests were made at various stabilizer settings for several power and model conditions. These tests were made with the elevator both fixed at  $0^\circ$  and free to float. Elevator and elevator-tab tests were also made on the complete model for similar power and model conditions. In addition, isolated horizontal-tail characteristics were determined. Several slotted flap deflections were tested. Photographs of tufts placed on the wing were made to determine the stall progression for several power and model conditions.

A short outline of the figures showing the results of the longitudinal stability and control investigation is presented in the following table:

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

11

Figure no.

A. Elevator-fixed stability:	
Stabilizer tests . . . . .	7
Neutral points . . . . .	8
Stability determinants . . . . .	9
B. Elevator-free stability:	
Stabilizer tests . . . . .	10
Neutral points . . . . .	11
C. Isolated tail characteristics:	
Elevator tests . . . . .	12
Elevator-tab tests . . . . .	13
D. Elevator control characteristics:	
Elevator tests . . . . .	14
Elevator-tab tests . . . . .	15
E. Landing flap characteristics . . . . .	16
F. Stall characteristics . . . . .	17-22

DISCUSSION

Elevator-fixed stability.- The elevator of the XB7C-1 airplane is equipped with a spring tab. With the stick fixed, the elevator, therefore, is not necessarily fixed as is true for a conventional control system without cable stretch. However, neutral points obtained from flight data are generally determined from the variation of elevator angle with velocity rather than the variation of stick position with velocity. Thus, the presence of the spring may be treated as an additional source of flexibility in the control system and neutral points can then be obtained by usual methods. (See reference 1.)

The static margin is positive for all conditions tested at all contemplated airplane center-of-gravity locations. (See fig. 8.) The effect of power on the longitudinal stability was unusually small.

The propeller used on the model was of the same diameter as the scaled-down airplane propeller diameter but the side-force factor was 65.8 as compared to an

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

12

MR No. L5D27a

airplane value of 91.3. However, a similar difference of model and airplane propeller side-force factors in another investigation was found to give a forward neutral-point shift of less than 0.01 mean aerodynamic chord. (See reference 2.) Inasmuch as this value is well within the accuracy of the neutral-point calculation, it can be neglected.

An attempt has been made to analyze the effects of power on the longitudinal stability. In order to do this various factors which affect the stability of the airplane have been calculated and are shown on figure 9. It may be shown that for neutral stability and assuming a constant tail lift-curve slope

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dC_m}{dC_L} &= 0 \\ &= \left( \frac{dC_m}{dC_L} \right)_0 - \frac{\frac{S_t l_t}{S_c} \left( \frac{\partial C_L}{\partial \alpha} \right)_{t_1} \frac{q_t}{q} \left( 1 - \frac{d\epsilon}{d\alpha} \right)}{\left( \frac{dC_L}{d\alpha} \right)_1} + \frac{C_{m_t}}{\frac{q_t}{q}} \frac{d\left( \frac{q_t}{q} \right)}{dC_L} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

which reduces to

$$n_p = n_0 + \frac{\left| \frac{dC_m}{d\epsilon} \right|}{\left( \frac{dC_L}{d\alpha} \right)_1} \left( 1 - \frac{d\epsilon}{d\alpha} \right) - \frac{C_{m_t}}{\frac{q_t}{q}} \frac{d\left( \frac{q_t}{q} \right)}{dC_L} \quad (2)$$

inasmuch as

$$\left| \frac{dC_m}{d\epsilon} \right| = \frac{S_t l_t}{S_c} \left( \frac{\partial C_L}{\partial \alpha} \right)_{t_1} \frac{q_t}{q}$$

and

$$n_p - n_0 = \left( \frac{dC_m}{dC_L} \right)_0 \quad (\text{at the neutral point})$$

where the notations are as previously defined in the text.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

13

Thus, the relative weight of the various factors which contribute both favorably and unfavorably to the longitudinal stability can be estimated for any condition from the preceding equations. In addition, the effects of power can be separated to some degree.

In the cruising configuration and at moderate lift coefficients the model has more stability with take-off power than it does with the propeller windmilling. Using figures 7 and 9 to obtain the values of the various stability determinants at  $C_L = 0.8$ , it is found from equation (2) that the stabilizing effects of a rearward movement of  $n_o$  (0.055 mean aerodynamic chord) and of increased  $\frac{d(q_t/q)}{dC_L}$  at the tail (0.030 mean aerodynamic chord) more than compensate for the 0.060 mean aerodynamic chord loss in stability caused mainly by a higher value of  $\partial \epsilon / \partial \alpha$  with power. Thus, the total change in stability due to power at  $C_L = 0.8$  as determined from the summation of individual effects is found to be a 0.025 mean aerodynamic chord rearward shift of the neutral point. This value compares with the measured value of 0.022 mean aerodynamic chord (fig. 8). The discrepancy is quite small in this instance and, in general, it is believed to be within the accuracy of the neutral-point determination (approximately 0.02 mean aerodynamic chord).

At very low-lift coefficients the stability in the cruising configuration becomes less power on than power off. This is seen to be chiefly caused by the rate of change of dynamic pressure at the tail. For while at a higher coefficient  $\frac{d(q_t/q)}{dC_L}$  is responsible for a favorable effect,  $\Delta n_p = 0.03$  mean aerodynamic chord, at  $C_L = 0.2$  an adverse shift of  $\Delta n_p = 0.015$  is realized. The main reason for this change is that the tail load for trim is negative and hence favorable at higher lift coefficients but becomes positive at low values of  $C_L$ .

In the landing configuration the change in neutral-point location with the application of power is fairly constant, small, and always stabilizing. (See fig. 8.) This may be explained by the extremely

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

14

NR No. 15D27a

large rearward shift in tail-off aerodynamic center location with power. The difference in  $n_0$  increases at high lifts and thus counteracts the loss in the stability contributed by the empennage, inasmuch as progressively larger values of  $d\epsilon/d\alpha$  and  $\frac{d(qt/q)}{dC_L}$  are both destabilizing.

Some of the design features, which may in part account for the small change in stability with power through the lift range as well as the over-all satisfactory stability characteristics, are the high location of the horizontal tail and rectangular inboard wing panels with constant chord flaps. Data showing favorable effects of the two aforementioned model features can be found in reference 3. In addition, the design center-of-gravity location is considerably below the thrust line so that the direct thrust moment is favorable.

Elevator-free stability.- The static margin will be positive for all conditions tested at all contemplated airplane center-of-gravity locations with the elevator free (fig. 11).

In general, the elevator-free neutral points are from 0 to 6 percent mean aerodynamic chord farther aft than the corresponding elevator-fixed neutral points for similar conditions. Compare figures 11 and 8. An exception to this trend is found in the take-off power condition, in the landing configuration, and at high lift coefficients where the stability is considerably less with the elevator free.

It can be seen from the isolated-tail data of figure 12 that the ratio of the hinge-moment parameters  $-\frac{(\partial C_{h_e}/\partial \alpha)_{t_1}}{(\partial C_{h_e}/\partial \delta)_{t_1}}$  which determines the floating characteristics of the elevator is of such sign as to cause the elevator to float against the relative wind and thus increase the tail effectiveness and hence the stability (inasmuch as  $d\epsilon/d\alpha$  is less than unity). Apparently, however, in the landing configuration with take-off power  $(\partial C_{h_e}/\partial \alpha)_t$  becomes negative at high-lift coefficients (fig. 14(e)) thus reducing the tail effectiveness. It might be noted

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

15

that this change in  $(dC_{he}/d\alpha)_t$  is probably a result of the nonlinear hinge-moment characteristics (fig. 12) combined with a large reduction in tail angle of attack over the right inboard portion of the tail and a similar increase in angle of attack over the left inboard portion which is caused by right-hand propeller operation (reference 4). The greatest part of the decrease in stability is not thought to be caused by a reduction in tail effectiveness due to negative  $(dC_{he}/d\alpha)_t$  but rather by the rate of change of tail effectiveness with lift coefficient. Thus, in order to determine the power effects with the elevator free, the following term must be added to equation (2):

$$\frac{-C_{m_t}}{\left(\frac{dC_L}{d\alpha}\right)_t} \frac{d\left(\frac{dC_L}{d\alpha}\right)_t}{dC_L}$$

where the notation used has been previously defined.

The elevator-free curves shown as dashed lines on figures 10(a) and 10(b) were obtained by cross-plotting the hinge-moment data of figures 14(a) and 14(b). This was necessary inasmuch as severe oscillations of the elevator occurred with the stabilizer incidence set at a value lower than  $3^\circ$  or  $4^\circ$  in the cruising configuration. This might be attributed to a positive value of  $(dC_{he}/d\alpha)_t$ .

The presence and type of oscillations on the airplane will depend on such factors as control surface and airplane inertia, control system friction, stability, and certain other factors. (See reference 5.)

Isolated horizontal tail.— A series of tests was made for various elevator and elevator-tab settings on the isolated horizontal tail. (See figs. 12 and 13.) The elevator-free curve, shown on figure 12, was obtained using the hinge-moment data. The difference between the hinge-moment curves at zero tab and elevator deflections (figs. 12 and 13) may be attributed to the fact that these tests were run at different times and the differences in the two curves are an indication of the experimental accuracy.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

16

MR No. L5D27a

The following table summarizes the elevator parameters:

	Original	Gap sealed	Elevator free
$\left(\frac{\partial C_L}{\partial \alpha}\right)_{t_1}$	0.0565	0.0575	0.069
$\left(\frac{\partial C_L}{\partial \delta}\right)_{t_1}$	.034	-----	-----
$\left(\frac{\partial C_{h_e}}{\partial \alpha}\right)_{t_1}$	0.000 (average for two tests)	-----	-----
$\left(\frac{\partial C_{h_e}}{\partial \delta}\right)_{t_1}$	-0.0057	-----	-----

As is shown by the preceding table, sealing the gap increased the lift-curve slope by about 2 percent, which is of the expected magnitude inasmuch as the gap was only from about 0.001 to 0.002c<sub>t</sub>.

The slope of the elevator-free lift curve showed about a 22-percent average increase over the elevator-fixed slope. Although this appears contradictory in view of the tabulated value of  $\left(\partial C_{h_e}/\partial \alpha\right)_{t_1}$ , it must be remembered that the hinge-moment characteristics are nonlinear and the tabulated value is an average value of slopes measured over a small angle-of-attack range at the origin.

The tab effectiveness  $\left(\partial C_{h_e}/\partial \delta_t\right)_{t_1}$  averaged about -0.0053 at moderate deflections in the angle-of-attack range likely to be encountered under normal operating conditions of the airplane.

Effect of elevator and elevator-tab deflection.-  
The elevator effectiveness as determined from figure 14(a) is about 0.9 as high as that obtained from isolated-tail data using the relationship

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

17

$$\frac{\delta C_m}{\delta \delta_e} = - \left( \frac{\delta C_L}{\delta \delta_e} \right)_{t_1} \times \frac{S_{t_1} l_t}{S_e} \quad (3)$$

where the symbols have been previously denoted in the text. This effectiveness ratio of 0.9 indicates that the average dynamic pressure over the elevator on the complete model is about 0.9 of the free stream  $q$ .

The data (fig. 14) indicate that the elevator should be sufficiently powerful to trim the airplane at any speed away from the ground for all conditions.

As has been stated earlier in the text, a large degree of the aerodynamic balance of the elevator is supplied by a spring tab. Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to present detailed control-force characteristics, estimates using the hinge-moment data of figures 14 and 15 indicate that the control forces for conditions of steady flight will be very light if the spring stiffness contemplated for the prototype airplane is used. However, since it is believed to be a relatively simple task to change the spring constant on the airplane, no major difficulty is likely to be encountered in obtaining a spring constant which will give satisfactory stick-force characteristics.

The power-off tab effectiveness  $dC_{h_e}/d\delta_t$  (figs. 15 (a) and 15(c)) agrees well with that obtained from isolated-tail tests. It might be noted that the ratio of  $\frac{dC_{h_e}}{d\delta_t} / \frac{dC_{h_e}}{d\delta_e}$  increases with  $C_L$  for the power-on conditions, indicating that the average dynamic pressure over the tab is greater than that over the elevator. This increases the spring-tab effectiveness but has no bearing on elevator-free stability inasmuch as the tab is not used for trimming purposes.

It may also be noted from the data of figure 15 that tab deflection appears to have a considerable effect on the pitching-moment curve. It is believed, however, that the neutral-point location will be negligibly affected by tab deflection because of the small spring-tab deflections which will be required with trim elevator deflections at the center of gravity for neutral stability.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

18

MR No. 15D27a

Effect of slotted-flap deflection.- Tail-off data were obtained at various slotted-flap deflections. (See fig. 16.) The maximum lift coefficients obtained from this figure are tabulated in the following table and have been corrected for tail load required for trim at the design center-of-gravity location.

Configuration	$\delta_f$ (deg)	$C_{L_{max}}$
Cruising	0	1.34
Landing	30	1.79
↓	35	1.78
	40	1.84
	45	1.84

The change in maximum lift coefficient when the flap deflection is increased from 30° to 45° is seen to be quite small. It may also be seen that at angles of attack slightly below the stall an appreciable increment in lift is obtained when the flap deflection is increased in the higher range.

Stalling characteristics.- Photographs of the tufts showing the stall progression are shown for the different model configurations. (See figs. 17 through 22.)

In the windmilling, cruising configuration, the stall appears to start at the trailing edge slightly inboard of the fold line. As the angle of attack is increased the stall progresses forward over the inboard wing panel while not progressing markedly toward the tip. The final photograph (fig. 17) at  $\alpha = 17.3^\circ$  shows the inboard wing panels almost completely stalled while over a large portion of the outboard panel the flow is merely unsteady. Removal of the radar, wing tank, and guns seems to have a very slight effect on the stall progression in the cruising configuration. (Compare figs. 17 and 18.) When take-off power is applied in the cruising condition, the portion of the wing immersed in the slipstream remains unstalled after most of the remainder of the wing is stalled. The stall appears to be earlier and more pronounced over the left inboard wing panel than it is over the right panel which might be expected for right-hand propeller operation (fig. 19).

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

19

In the landing condition, with the propeller windmilling, the flaps appear to be generally stalled or in a region of unsteady flow at low angles of attack. As the angle of attack increases, the flow through the slot improves and the flaps become unstalled. The wing remains unstalled up to about  $15^\circ$  or  $16^\circ$  angle of attack. The stall then begins at the left inboard fold line spreading inboard much more rapidly than it progresses toward the tip. The last photograph on figure 20 shows that while a good portion of the left panel is stalled, the right panel is either unstalled or only in a region of unsteady flow at  $\alpha = 18.1^\circ$ , except at the extreme right wing tip where stall has begun. The pictures on figure 21, guns, radar, and fuel tank off would seem to indicate that the absence of the latter auxiliary equipment causes stall over the left inboard panel much earlier than is shown in figure 20 (auxiliary equipment on). The reason for this effect is not known. Otherwise, except for a lesser tendency for tip stall on the right wing tip, the progression of the stall with and without the auxiliary equipment is similar. The chief effect of power on the stall is again a stall delay in regions close to the wing-fuselage juncture (fig. 22).

Because of differences in scale, the amount of stall indicated at each angle may differ from that on the full-scale airplane but the stall progression should be correct.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the longitudinal stability and control investigation of a 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane indicate that:

1. The longitudinal stability will probably be satisfactory for all probable flight conditions at the rearmost center-of-gravity location with the elevator both fixed and free. Power effects were quite small.
2. Sufficient elevator control will be available to trim in any flight condition away from the ground. Indications are that the stick forces may be light if the spring stiffness now contemplated is used.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

20

MR No. L5D27a

3. Increasing the slotted flap deflection above  $30^\circ$  increased  $C_{l_{max}}$  only slightly.

4. Stalling characteristics will probably be satisfactory. In general, stall started at the wing fold line and spread inboard faster than toward the tip. Power delayed stall over portions of the wing immersed in the slipstream. The presence of the fuel tank, radar, and wing guns do not appreciably affect the stall trends.

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory  
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics  
Langley Field, Va.

*Joseph Weil*  
Joseph Weil  
Aeronautical Engineer

*Rebecca I. Boykin*  
Rebecca I. Boykin  
Computer

Approved: *Hartley A. Soule*  
Hartley A. Soule  
Chief of Stability Research Division

ES

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

21

REFERENCES

1. Schuldenfrei, Marvin: Some Notes on the Determination of the Stick-Fixed Neutral Point from Wind-Tunnel Data. NACA RB No. 3120, 1943.
2. Weil, Joseph, and Rhodes, Varina K.: Wind-Tunnel Tests of the 1/8-Scale Powered Model of the Grumman F6F-3 Airplane. I - Longitudinal Stability and Control. NACA MR No. L5A20, Bur. Aero., 1945.
3. Weil, Joseph, and Wells, Evalyn G.: Wind-Tunnel Tests of the 1/8-Scale Powered Model of the Curtiss XBTC-2 Airplane. I - Preliminary Investigation of Longitudinal Stability. NACA MR, Bur. Aero., June 1, 1944.
4. Pass, H. R.: Wind-Tunnel Study of the Effects of Propeller Operation and Flap Deflection on the Pitching Moments and Elevator Hinge Moments of a Single-Engine Pursuit-Type Airplane. NACA ARR, July 1942.
5. Greenberg, Harry and Sternfield, Leonard: A Theoretical Investigation of the Longitudinal Stability of Airplanes with Free Controls Including Effect of Friction in Control System. NACA ARR No. 4B01, 1944.

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

TABLE I

DESCRIPTION OF FLEETWINGS XBTK-1 AIRPLANE

Name and type . . . . .	XBTK-1 (Navy dive-torpedo bomber)
Engine . . . . .	Pratt & Whitney R-2800-22W
Ratings:	
Normal power . . . . .	{ 1700 bhp at 2600 rpm at sea level 1700 bhp at 2600 rpm at 7000 ft 1450 bhp at 2600 rpm at 18,500 ft
Take-off power . . . . .	{ 2100 bhp at 2800 rpm at sea level 2100 bhp at 2800 rpm at 1000 ft
Military power . . . . .	{ 1600 bhp at 2800 rpm at 16,000 ft
Propeller . . . . .	Hamilton Standard
Diameter, ft . . . . .	13.58
Blades (number and designation) . . . . .	four, 2C15B1
Gear ratio . . . . .	0.45
Activity factor . . . . .	95.6
Blade thickness (h/b) . . . . .	0.060
Normal gross weight, lb . . . . .	14,850
Over-all length, ft . . . . .	39.0
Over-all height, ft . . . . .	11.86
Wing span, ft . . . . .	48.67

NATIONAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

TABLE II  
AIRPLANE WING- AND TAIL-SURFACE DATA

	Wing	Horizontal tail	Vertical tail
Area, sq ft	380	80	<sup>a</sup> 51.25
Span, ft	48.67	18.5	8.38
Aspect ratio	6.23	4.26	1.42
Taper ratio	.50	.59	-----
Dihedral, deg	8.25	0	-----
Incidence, deg	2	2 to -7	0
Geometric twist, deg	-2.2	0	0
Root section	NACA 2416	NACA 66.2-015 modified	NACA 66.2-015 modified
Tip section	NACA 4412	NACA 66.2-009 modified	NACA 66.2-009 modified
Mean aerodynamic chord, ft	8.17	-----	-----
Root chord, ft	9.17	5.45	6.89
Theoretical tip chord, ft	4.585	3.20	2.67

<sup>a</sup>Includes dorsal fin.

NATIONAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

TABLE III  
AIRPLANE CONTROL-SURFACE DATA

	Ailerons	Elevators	Rudder	Flaps	Dive brakes
Percent span	54.0	95.0	100	43.1	Upper 31.4 Lower 35.1
Area, aft of hinge line, sq ft	36.86	22.50	15.66	42.0	-----
Balance area, sq ft	15.11	2.96	45.02	-----	-----
Trim-tab area, sq ft	6.52	None	1.00	-----	-----
Percent span	2.8	-----	23.0	-----	-----
Tab travel, deg	±15	-----	±5	-----	-----
Balance tab area, sq ft	2.76	3.36	1.00	-----	-----
Percent span	13.3	35.7	23.0	-----	-----
Tab travel, deg	±15(±30 lb)	±15(±55 lb)	±15(δt=-0.51δr)	-----	-----
Control travel, deg	±15	15, -25	±30	45	Upper 73 Lower 80
Root mean square chord, ft	1.37	1.27	1.90	2.06	Upper 1.45 Lower 1.55
Distance to hinge line from normal c.g. (25.6), ft	-----	22.00	23.67	-----	-----

a1.20-square-foot horn.

bLeft aileron only.

cMeasured from airfoil contour.

Flap deflections (corresponding powers)

Landing, deg . . . . . 45 (power off)

Take-off, deg . . . . . 32.5 (2100 hp)

All other conditions : flaps retracted

National Advisory  
Committee for Aeronautics

CONFIDENTIAL

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1.- Three-view drawing of 0.15-scale model of Fleetwings XBTK-1 airplane.

Figure 2(a).- Three-quarter front view of the 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane.

Figure 2(b).- Three-quarter rear view of the 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane.

Figure 3.- Details of slotted flap positions for various deflections tested on the 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane.

Figure 4.- Drawing of horizontal tail of 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane.

Figure 5.- Characteristics of a 2.04-foot diameter four-bladed propeller on 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane.  $\alpha = 0^\circ$ ;  $\beta = 18^\circ$ .

Figure 6.- Thrust coefficient available at any lift coefficient for the XBTK-1 airplane with 60 percent rated and take-off power. Sea level conditions,  
 $\frac{W}{S} = 39.1$ .

Figure 7.- Effect of stabilizer on the aerodynamic characteristics in pitch of the 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane.

(a) Windmilling, cruising configuration.

Figure 7.- Continued.

(b) Take-off power, cruising configuration.

Figure 7.- Continued.

(c) Windmilling, landing configuration.

Figure 7.- Concluded.

(d) Take-off power, landing configuration.

CONFIDENTIAL

2

MR No. L5D27a

FIGURE LEGENDS - Continued

Figure 8.- Elevator-fixed neutral points of the XBTK-1 airplane as determined from wind-tunnel tests of a 0.15-scale model.  $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ .

Figure 9.- Effect of power on various longitudinal stability determinants of the XBTK-1 airplane as estimated from tests of a 0.15-scale model.

(a) Cruising configuration.

Figure 9.- Continued.

(a) Concluded.

Figure 9.- Continued.

(b) Landing configuration.

Figure 9.- Concluded.

(b) Concluded.

Figure 10.- Effect of stabilizer on the aerodynamic characteristics in pitch of the 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane.  $\delta_e$ , free.

(a) Windmilling, cruising configuration.

Figure 10.- Continued.

(b) Take-off power, cruising configuration.

Figure 10.- Continued.

(c) Windmilling, landing configuration.

Figure 10.- Concluded.

(d) Take-off power, landing configuration.

Figure 11.- Elevator-free neutral points of the XBTK-1 airplane as determined from wind-tunnel tests of a 0.15-scale model.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

3

FIGURE LEGENDS - Continued

Figure 12.- Effect of elevator deflection on the aerodynamic characteristics of the isolated horizontal tail of 0.15-scale model of Fleetwings XBTK-1 airplane,  $\delta_t = 0^\circ$ .

Figure 12.- Concluded.

Figure 13.- Effect of tab deflection on the aerodynamic characteristics of the isolated horizontal tail of 0.15-scale model of Fleetwings XBTK-1 airplane,  $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ .

Figure 13.- Concluded.

Figure 14.- Effect of elevator deflection on the aerodynamic characteristics in pitch of the 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane.  $\delta_t = 0^\circ$ ,  $i_t = 1^\circ 0'$ .

(a) Windmilling, cruising configuration.

Figure 14.- Continued.

(a) Concluded.

Figure 14.- Continued.

(b) Take-off power, cruising configuration.

Figure 14.- Continued.

(b) Concluded.

Figure 14.- Continued.

(c) Windmilling, landing configuration.

Figure 14.- Continued.

(c) Concluded.

Figure 14.- Continued.

(d) 60-percent rated power, landing configuration.

Figure 14.- Continued.

(d) Concluded.

CONFIDENTIAL

**CONFIDENTIAL**

4

MR No. L5D27a

**FIGURE LEGENDS - Continued**

**Figure 14.- Continued.**

(e) Take-off power, landing configuration.

**Figure 14.- Concluded.**

(e) Concluded.

**Figure 15.- Effect of elevator tab deflection on the aerodynamic characteristics in pitch of the 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane.  $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ ,  $i_t = 100'$ .**

(a) Windmilling, cruising configuration.

**Figure 15.- Continued.**

(a) Concluded.

**Figure 15.- Continued.**

(b) Take-off power, cruising configuration.

**Figure 15.- Continued.**

(b) Concluded.

**Figure 15.- Continued.**

(c) Windmilling, landing configuration

**Figure 15.- Continued.**

(c) Concluded.

**Figure 15.- Continued.**

(d) 60-percent rated power, landing configuration.

**Figure 15.- Continued.**

(d) Concluded.

**Figure 15.- Continued.**

(e) Take-off power, landing configuration.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

MR No. L5D27a

5

**FIGURE LEGENDS - Concluded**

**Figure 15.- Concluded.**

(e) Concluded.

**Figure 16.- Effect of flap deflection on the aerodynamic characteristics in pitch of the 0.15-scale model of the XBTK-1 airplane. Tail-off, windmilling.**

**Figure 17.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Cruising configuration; windmilling; guns, fuel tank and radar on; tail-off.**

**Figure 18.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Cruising configuration; windmilling; guns, fuel tank, and radar off; tail-off.**

**Figure 19.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Cruising configuration; take-off power; guns, fuel tank, and radar on; tail-off.**

**Figure 20.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Landing configuration; windmilling; guns, fuel tank, and radar on, tail-off.**

**Figure 21.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Landing configuration; windmilling; guns, fuel tank, and radar off, tail-off.**


**Figure 22.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Landing configuration, take-off power; guns, fuel tank, and radar on, tail-off.**

**CONFIDENTIAL**



1382

MR No. L5D27a



Root section - NACA 2416  
 Tip section - NACA 4412  
 Wing area - 8.55 ft<sup>2</sup>  
 MAC = 14.64 in.  
 Design CG (wheels up) 23.6 % MAC  
 Taper ratio, outboard panel - .50  
 Geometric twist of outboard panel - 2.2°  
 Incidence of inboard panel - 2°0'

Figure 1 -- Three view drawing of 0.15-scale model of Fleetwings XBTK-1 airplane.

13829

MR No. L5D27a

CONFIDENTIAL



Figure 2(a).- Three-quarter front view of the 0.15-scale model of the XB7K-1 airplane.

CONFIDENTIAL

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS  
LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL ESTABLISHMENT - HAMPSHIRE FIELD, VA.

CONFIDENTIAL




Figure 2(b).- Three-quarter rear view of the 0.15-scale model of the XB7K-1 airplane.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS  
LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY - LANGLEY FIELD, VA.

CONFIDENTIAL








Figure 3 -- Details of slotted flap positions for various deflections tested on the 0.15 scale model of the XB7C-1 airplane.













CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a



CONFIDENTIAL


MR No. L5D27a



13


13

MR No. L5D27a



CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a







Figure 8.-Elevator-fired neutral points of the XB7E-1 airplane as determined from wind-tunnel tests of a 0.15 scale model  $\delta_e = 0^\circ$ .




1333

MR No. L5D27a



SECRET


MF No. L5D27a




03

133

MR No. L5D27a








(b) concluded.  
Figure 9.-concluded.


135230

MR No. L5D27a




9303

MR No. L5D27a




13099

MP No. L5D27a



1369

MP No. L5D27a



138211

MP No. L5D27a






Figure 11 - Elevator-free neutral points of the XBTK-1 airplane as determined from wind-tunnel tests of a 0.15 scale model.





135213


MP No. L5D27a






CONFIDENTIAL

MF No. LEO274




SECRET

MR No. L5D27a




1507

MR No. L5D27a




SECRET

MR No. L5D27a




SECRET

MR No. L5D27a



CONFIDENTIAL


MR No. L5D27a






44-2439

MF No. LFD27a



CONFIDENTIAL


MR No. L5D27a






SECRET

MR No. L5D27a




1524

MR No. L5D27a




13024

MR No. L5D27a




CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a



CONFIDENTIAL


MR No. L5D27a






CONFIDENTIAL


MR No. L5D27a



CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a









15-23

MF No. LED27a




SECRET

MR No. L5D27a




1304

MF No. LFD27a




15  
25  
35  
45  
55  
65  
75  
85  
95

MR No. L5D27a



5709


MR No. L5D27a






CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a




13897

MP No. L5D27\*



MP No. L5D27a

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

NACA LMAL 41358

Figure 17.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane.  
Cruising configuration; windmilling; guns, fuel tank and  
radar on; tail-off.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS  
LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY - LANGLEY FIELD, VA.



Figure 1 displays a series of 10 stereoscopic images arranged in a 5x2 grid, showing the deformation of a grid pattern under various conditions. The images are labeled with parameters  $\alpha$  and  $Q$  on the right side of each pair.

- Row 1:  $\alpha = -6.2^\circ$ ,  $Q = -0.23$
- Row 2:  $\alpha = -9.0^\circ$ ,  $Q = -0.37$
- Row 3:  $\alpha = -12.0^\circ$ ,  $Q = -0.50$
- Row 4:  $\alpha = -14.7^\circ$ ,  $Q = -0.66$
- Row 5:  $\alpha = -16.3^\circ$ ,  $Q = -0.80$


**NACA LMAL 41360**

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS  
LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY - LANGLEY FIELD, VA.

CONFIDENTIAL

MR No. L5D27a

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

NACA LMAL 41359


Figure 19.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Cruising configuration; take-off power; guns, fuel tank, and radar on; tail-off.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS  
LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY - LANGLEY FIELD, VA.

9202

MF No. L5D27a

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL


NACA LMAL 41362

Figure 20.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Landing configuration; windmilling; guns, fuel tank, and radar on, tail-off.

104000

MR No. L5D27a

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL


NACA LMAL 41361

Figure 21.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Landing configuration; windmilling; guns, fuel tank, and radar off, tail-off.

22  
22  
22  
22  
22

MR No. L5D27a

CONFIDENTIAL



CONFIDENTIAL

NACA LMAL 41363

Figure 22.- Tuft study of 0.15-scale model of XBTK-1 airplane. Landing configuration, take-off power: guns, fuel tank, and radar on, tail-off.

REEL - C  
5 8 8

A.T.I.

1 6 4 0 4

## CONFIDENTIAL

ATI- 18404

REVISION (None)

ORIG. AGENCY NO.  
MR-L5D27a

PUBLISHING AGENCY NO.

TITLE: Wind Tunnel Tests of the 0.15-Scale Powered Model of the Fleetwings XBTK-1  
Airplane - I - Longitudinal Stability and Control  
AUTHOR(S): Weil, Joseph; Boykin, R. I.  
ORIGINATING AGENCY: National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D.C.  
PUBLISHED BY: (Same)

DATE	DOC. CLASS.	COUNTRY	LANGUAGE	PAGES	ILLUSTRATIONS
May '45	<del>Confidential</del>	U.S.	Eng.	81	photos, graphs, dwgs

ABSTRACT: *W4c/505.*

An investigation was made of the static longitudinal stability, and control and stall characteristics of XBTK-1 dive bomber. Results indicate that the longitudinal stability will probably be satisfactory for all contemplated flight conditions at the rear-most CG location with elevator both fixed and free. Power effects were small. Sufficient elevator control will be available to trim in any flight condition above the ground. Increasing the slotted flap deflection above 30° only slightly increased the max. lift coefficient.

DISTRIBUTION: Request copies of this report only from Originating Agency

DIVISION: Aerodynamics (2)  
SECTION: Stability and Control (1)

SUBJECT HEADINGS: Longitudinal stability (56020.32); Airplanes - Control characteristics (08393); Airplanes - Stalling characteristics (08487.5); XBTK-1 (58020.32) (08487.5)

ATI SHEET NO.: C-2-1-1

Air Documents Division, Intelligence Department  
Air Materiel Command

AIR TECHNICAL INDEX  
CONFIDENTIAL

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base  
Dayton, Ohio



~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TITLE: Wind Tunnel Tests of the 0.15-Scale Powered Model of the Fleetwings XBTK-1  
Airplane - I - Longitudinal Stability and Control  
AUTHOR(S): Well, Joseph; Boykin, R. I.  
ORIGINATING AGENCY: National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D.C.  
PUBLISHED BY: (Same)

ATI- 16404

REVISION (None)

ORIG. AGENCY NO.  
MR-L5D27a

PUBLISHING AGENCY NO.

DATE	DOC. CLASS.	COUNTRY	LANGUAGE	PAGES	ILLUSTRATIONS
May '45	Conf'd	U.S.	Eng.	81	photos, graphs, dwgs (over)

ABSTRACT:

An investigation was made of the static longitudinal stability, and control and stall characteristics of XBTK-1 dive bomber. Results indicate that the longitudinal stability will probably be satisfactory for all contemplated flight conditions at the rear-most CG location with elevator both fixed and free. Power effects were small. Sufficient elevator control will be available to trim in any flight condition above the ground. Increasing the slotted flap deflection above 30° only slightly increased the max. lift coefficient.

DISTRIBUTION: Request copies of this report only from Originating Agency

DIVISION: Aerodynamics (2)  
SECTION: Stability and Control (1)

1-9  
2-677

SUBJECT HEADINGS: Longitudinal stability (56020.32); Airplanes - Control characteristics (08393); Airplanes - Stalling characteristics (08487.5); XBTK-1 (56020.32) (08487.5)

ATI SHEET NO.: C-2-1-1

Air Documents Division, Intelligence Department  
Air Materiel Command

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
AIR TECHNICAL INDEX

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base  
Dayton, Ohio



Classification cancelled

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

AUTH: *NACA, Declassification List #1 dt MARCH 49*

By *George R. Jordan*, ~~USCO~~  
Signature and Title

Date *23 Jan 50*

*Consolidated*

FEB 1 1950